

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 474 874

UD 035 583

AUTHOR Nelson, F. Howard; Gould, Jewell C.  
TITLE Teacher Salaries, Expenditures and Federal Revenue in School Districts Serving the Nation's Largest Cities, 1990-91 to 2000-01. Research Report.  
INSTITUTION American Federation of Teachers, Washington, DC.  
PUB DATE 2001-10-00  
NOTE 29p.  
AVAILABLE FROM American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, 555 New Jersey Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20001-2079. Web site: <http://www.aft.org>.  
PUB TYPE Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)  
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS Compensatory Education; \*Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; Enrollment Trends; Federal Aid; \*Low Income Groups; \*Minority Group Children; \*Teacher Salaries; \*Urban Schools  
IDENTIFIERS \*Achievement Gap

## ABSTRACT

This report provides data on school districts in the nation's largest cities regarding decade-long national trends in teacher salaries, expenditures, and federal revenue, particularly compensatory education funding. These districts, which are working to close achievement gaps, enroll disproportionate and increasingly larger shares of low-income and minority students. The report provides similar data for the 100 largest individual cities. All but two cities showed increases in the percentage of students receiving special education services, and all but one showed increases in the percentage of students eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunch. All of these 100 cities showed increases in minority student enrollments. Three out of four cities coped with enrollment growth. The economy grew at a much faster rate than teacher salaries, which did not increase as much as salaries for all workers. Total spending for public K-12 education grew from \$206 to \$353 billion in the 1990s. Gaps between expenditure growth and teacher salary growth were largest at the end of the decade, a period of teacher shortages. Federal revenue increased faster than total education spending. The leveling off of federal support for disadvantaged students occurred at the same time as big cities came under increasing pressure to close minority-majority student achievement gaps. (SM)

ED 474 874

# Teacher Salaries, Expenditures and Federal Revenue in School Districts Serving the Nation's Largest Cities, 1990-91 to 2000-01

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*J. Gould*  
*American Federation of Teachers*  
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

F. Howard Nelson  
Jewell C. Gould

October 2001

---

**American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO**  
555 New Jersey Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20001-2079

Sandra Feldman, PRESIDENT  
Edward J. McElroy, SECRETARY-TREASURER  
Nat LaCour, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

**AFT Research & Information Services Department**

---

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

---

## Foreword

This report provides basic information for school districts in the nation's largest cities regarding teacher salaries, expenditures, and federal revenue. Although school districts in cities with more than 100,000 residents serve only one in five students in the United States, these districts are the focus of efforts to close the achievement gap. Large cities also enroll a disproportionate and increasingly larger share of low-income and minority students.

This research represents the first time the AFT has prepared a report of this type for big cities, but it also highlights trends over the past decade. Our study features teacher salary data on large city school districts prepared for the U.S. Department of Defense by the Civilian Personnel Management Service, Wage and Salary Division. These salary data offer a first look at teacher salaries for the 2000-01 school year. Next spring, the AFT will publish comprehensive information on state and national teacher salary averages for the 2000-01 school year.

This study is divided into two parts. The first part elaborates on the decade-long national trend in urban teacher salaries (cities with more than 100,000 residents), education spending and federal revenue, particularly compensatory education funding. The second part presents similar data for individual cities (the 100 largest).

---

## Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Part I: National Trends .....</b>	<b>3</b>
Teacher Salaries .....	3
Highlights.....	4
Beginning Teacher Salaries and Substitute Teacher Pay.....	4
Highlights.....	5
Expenditures and Federal Revenue.....	5
Table I-1. Teacher Salaries in Large Cities Adjusted for Inflation and Compared to Other Workers .....	7
Table I-2 Salaries for Beginning Teachers and Salary Offers for New College Graduates Outside the Field of Teaching.....	8
Table I-3 Teacher Salaries, Education Expenditures and Federal Revenue.....	9
<b>Part II: City-by-City Trends .....</b>	<b>10</b>
Teacher Salaries .....	10
Highlights.....	11
Substitute Teacher Pay.....	12
Revenue and Federal Support .....	12
Changing Student Demographics in Big Cities .....	13
Highlights of Changes between 1991-92 and 1998-99.....	13
Table II-1 Ten-Year Change in BA-Minimum and MA-Maximum Salaries in 100 Largest Cities.....	14
Table II-2 MA-Maximum Salaries Adjusted for the Cost of Living (Ranked) .....	16
Table II-3 BA-Beginning Salaries and Substitute Teacher Pay (Ranked).....	18
Table II-4 General Revenue Per Pupil and Federal Support, 1991-92 and 1997-98.....	20
Table II-5 Low-Income Students and Special Education .....	22
Table II-6 Change in Enrollment of Minority Students .....	24

## Executive Summary

Boosted by a 5.4 percent increase in 2000-01, a teacher with a master's degree at the top of the salary schedule in a typical big-city school earned \$51,955 annually. Over the past decade, however, urban teacher salaries grew at a yearly rate of only 3.2 percent, enough to keep ahead of inflation by just \$250 per year. In contrast, the annual earnings for all workers increased by a yearly average of 3.7 percent over the same 10 years. The economy grew at a much faster rate than teacher salaries. Gross domestic product per capita escalated at an annual rate averaging 5.3 percent.

A teacher shortage emerged in the mid 1990s when the market for new college graduates burned red hot. Beginning teacher salaries, however, increased at an average annual rate of only 3.2 percent compared to 3.9 percent for college graduates in fields outside education. In 1994-95, new college grads earned 17 percent more than beginning teachers; by the end of the decade the earnings advantage had jumped to 30 percent more.

Total spending for public K-12 education in the United States grew from \$206 billion to \$353 billion in the 1990s. Averaging 5.7 percent per year, growth in total education spending clearly outpaced growth in teacher salaries. After accounting for average annual enrollment increases of 1.1 percent, net total spending growth was 4.6 percent per year, ahead of inflation, which had an average annual growth rate of 2.6 percent. The gap between expenditure growth and teacher salary growth was largest at the end of the decade—during a period of teacher shortages.

Federal revenue increased even faster than total education spending, rising annually at a rate of 7.6 percent. After accounting for the average annual enrollment increase of 1.1 percent, net total spending growth was 6.5 percent per year, ahead of inflation (growing at 2.6 percent annually). Over the decade, the federal share of revenue rose from 5.1 percent of total revenue to 6.1 percent. The steepest growth in federal assistance occurred since 1996-98, up 38 percent, but little of the increase is specifically directed at compensatory education for disadvantaged students who are disproportionately concentrated in big cities. Federal per-pupil aid for compensatory education hardly increased, rising only 8 percent (slightly less than the rate of inflation, which increased 9.3 percent). Over the decade, the growth in need for compensatory education in big cities outstripped new funding. Students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch grew by 25 percent between 1991-92 and 1998-99, completely negating the impact of inflation-adjusted Title I spending increases early in the decade.

The leveling off of federal support for disadvantaged students occurred at precisely the same time as big cities came under increasing pressure to close the student achievement gap between poor, minority youth concentrated in city schools and their more-advantaged peers. Making the task of narrowing the achievement gap even more difficult, the education needs of youth in the nation's 100 largest cities continued to grow between 1991-92 and 1998-99:

- All but two cities showed an increase in the percentage of students receiving special education services, rising from 9.5 percent of students to 12.6 percent of students. See Table II-5.

- Every city, but one, showed an increase in the percentage of students eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunch. See Table II-5.
- The percentage of students eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunch increased from an average of 44.8 percent of students to 56.7 percent of students, a 25 percent increase in just seven years. See Table II-5.
- All of the 100 largest cities showed an increase in the enrollment of minority students, which increased from an average of 56.8 percent to 64.6 percent. See Table II-6.
- Three out of four cities had to cope with enrollment growth. Although less than the national average growth in enrollment (11.3 percent), big cities averaged growth of 5.4 percent. See Table II-6.

# **Teacher Salaries, Expenditures and Federal Revenues in School Districts Serving the Nation's Largest Cities, 1990-91 to 2000-01**

This report provides basic information for the nation's largest school districts (ranked by city size) regarding teacher salaries, expenditures, and federal outlays for compensatory education (primarily Title I). Although school districts in the 100 largest cities serve only one in five students in the United States, these districts are the focus of efforts to close the achievement gap. Large cities enroll a disproportionate share of low-income and minority students, and this burden has grown at the same time that pressure to improve student achievement has increased. Historically, the federal government has played an important role in promoting programs for disadvantaged youth.

This study is divided into two parts. The first part elaborates on the decade-long national trend in urban teacher salaries (cities with more than 100,000 residents), education spending and federal outlays, particularly compensatory education funding. The second part presents similar data for individual cities (the 100 largest).

## **Part I: National Trends**

### **Teacher Salaries**

The salary data in this section come from the Civilian Personnel Management Service, Wage and Salary Division of the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD). Congress requires that teachers in the overseas DOD dependent school system be paid a salary comparable to teachers in U.S. cities of more than 100,000 residents. Based on the 1990 census, the DOD data include 196 cities. DOD collects teacher contracts or wage agreements through October of each school year. These data provide early information on teacher salaries because they are based on wage schedules.<sup>1</sup> Average teacher salary data take much longer to collect.<sup>2</sup>

Many of the following analyses use data for the entry-level salary (BA-minimum), and the highest scheduled salary for a master's degree (MA-maximum). Generally, the MA-maximum salary is reached in continuous annual steps and does not include longevity increments. Longevity steps are non-annual steps added to the top of a salary schedule to reward teachers for years of service. The amount and timing vary in each school district. In the 2000-01 DOD data collection, annual steps ended at an average of the 14th year. For teachers with an MA, longevity steps of \$1,120 were given in the 18th, 22nd, 26th and 30th year of teaching service. These longevity steps are not included in the MA-maximum.

<sup>1</sup> For state average teacher salaries through 1999-2000, and historical trends, see Survey and Analysis of Teacher Salary Trends 2000, Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers, [www.aft.org/research/salary](http://www.aft.org/research/salary).

<sup>2</sup> Average salaries are usually calculated after the close of the fiscal year when the final cost of teacher salaries and the final count of teachers can be determined. States and cities calculate averages in different ways.

## Highlights

The following highlights are based on information in Table I-1.

- Propelled by high salary increases in California, the MA-maximum salary for large-city teachers increased 5.2 percent in 2000-01, the largest increase of any year in the past decade.
- Perhaps demonstrating the continuation of a general teacher shortage, and maintaining a three-year trend, the BA-minimum salary in urban districts increased at a faster rate (5.4 percent) in 2000-01 than the MA-maximum salary increased (5.2 percent).
- During the past decade, MA-maximum salaries increased 36.5 percent, an average increase of 3.2 percent per year.
- In each of the past three years, beginning salaries increased at a faster rate than MA-maximum salaries. Over the entire decade, however, minimum and maximum salaries grew at almost exactly the same rate. BA-minimum salaries increased 36.7 percent, an average increase of 3.2 percent per year.
- Helped immensely by the 2000-01 average salary increase, the inflation-adjusted urban teacher salary increased by 5.0 percent over the decade, or roughly \$250 per year.
- Urban teacher salaries grew slightly faster than the national average teacher salary from 1990-1991 through 1999-2000. Adjusted for inflation, the average teacher in the U.S. in 1999-2000, earned slightly less than in 1990-91.
- During the 1990s, the earnings growth of all workers in the U.S. economy (including teachers and government workers) averaged 3.7 percent a year, thus outpacing urban teacher salary growth, which grew 3.2 percent per year.

## Beginning Teacher Salaries and Substitute Teacher Pay

In the first half of the 1990s, the supply and demand for new teachers was balanced. Then, a substitute teacher shortage emerged. Stories of rampant out-of-field teaching and of districts issuing emergency teaching credentials soon followed. Now, a broad-based teacher shortage exists. The shortage hit many large cities very hard because they have the most difficulty in competing for scarce teachers.

Several economic and demographic trends coincided to cause the teacher shortage: A strong market for college graduates outside the field of teaching emerged in the late 1990s—in contrast to a depressed market in the first half of the decade. College graduates are now, more than ever,



choosing careers that pay more than teaching. A hot college job market hurts the ability of school districts to find substitute teachers because many recent college graduates do substitute teaching while seeking permanent work. In addition to the tight labor market for new college graduates, a greater percentage of teachers are reaching retirement age than at any point since World War II. In mature, slow-growth cities, teacher retirement has been a particularly irksome problem. Increasing enrollment, the result of what demographers call the “baby boomlet,” further complicated the shortage situation in the late 1990s. The impact of increasing enrollment has diminished over the past couple of years, but the demand for new teachers persists because state legislatures and the federal government have funded class-size reduction efforts.

The data in Table I-2 include the average daily substitute pay for cities in the DOD data; representing the first time that statistical data on substitute teacher salaries have been released to the public. Data for individual cities are shown in Table II-3. School districts can easily change substitute teacher pay, so a rapid response to a teacher shortage should be reflected in substitute pay.

## Highlights

The following highlights are based on information in Table I-2.

- In the early 1990s, corporate downsizing contributed to a poor job market for new college graduates. BA-minimum salaries in urban school districts increased at two or three times the rate of the salary offers for new college graduates through 1994-95, even though the average new teacher salaries still lagged behind those of other college graduates.
- During the past six years, salary offers for college graduates have grown faster than the average BA-minimum salary. In 2000-01, new college graduates received average salary offers reaching almost \$40,000 compared to an average BA-minimum salary in large cities of \$30,700.
- Over the entire decade, the average BA-minimum salary in large cities grew annually at an average of 3.2 percent, compared to 3.9 percent for college graduates.
- No evidence exists to support the idea that the substitute teacher shortage is any worse than the general teacher shortage. Over the decade, substitute teacher pay grew at a slightly slower rate (3.0 percent annually) than beginning teacher salaries (3.2 percent annually).
- Through the first nine years of the decade, the increase in the U.S. beginning teacher salary averaged 3.1 percent, practically equal to the urban average.

## Expenditures and Federal Revenue

Total spending for public K-12 education in the United States grew from \$206 billion to \$353 billion over the decade (Table I-3). Averaging 5.7 percent per year, growth in total education spending clearly outpaced teacher salary growth of 3.2 percent. After accounting for average

annual enrollment increases of 1.1 percent, net total spending growth was 4.6 percent per year, still well ahead of teacher salary growth and outpacing inflation (growing at 2.6 percent annually). Spending increased more than teacher salaries in each of the 10 years. The gap between expenditure growth and teacher salary growth was largest at the end of the decade during a period of teacher shortage.

Federal revenue increased even faster than total education spending, rising annually at a rate of 7.6 percent since 1990-91. After accounting for the average annual enrollment increase of 1.1 percent, net total spending growth was 6.5 percent per year, well ahead of inflation (growing at 2.6 percent annually). Over the decade, the federal share of revenue rose from 5.1 percent of the total to 6.1 percent. The steepest growth in federal assistance occurred over the past three years, up 38 percent, but little of the increase is specifically directed at compensatory education for disadvantaged students disproportionately concentrated in big cities.

Rising only 8 percent (less than increases needed to stay even with inflation), federal aid for compensatory education (Title I, Reading First and Even Start) hardly increased during the three years ending in 2000-01. Most of the recent increase in federal assistance to school districts went to special education (increasing from \$3.4 billion in 1997-98 to \$5.5 billion in 2000-01) and a variety of programs grouped into the broad category of school improvement (increasing from \$1.9 billion in 1997-98 to \$4.3 billion in 2000-01) initiatives including: professional development programs, Safe and Drug-Free Schools, 21st Century Community Learning Centers, Reading Excellence, educational technology, charter schools, class-size reduction, school renovation/construction (in 2001) and other programs. Some of these programs, particularly the class-size reduction program, were targeted at school districts with high concentrations of disadvantaged students.

With a disproportionate share of disadvantaged youth, large cities obviously depend more on federal revenue than the average school district. The available evidence on *trends* in federal support suggests that, on average, large cities fared no better or worse than other school districts through 1997-98. For the 100 largest cities, the federal share of general revenue changed little, rising from an average of 8.5 percent in 1991-92, to 8.6 percent in 1997-98 (Table II-4). For all school districts in the nation, the federal share of spending remained constant at 5.4 percent of total spending over the same six-year period.

Table I-1

## TEACHER SALARIES IN LARGE CITIES ADJUSTED FOR INFLATION AND COMPARED TO OTHER WORKERS

	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	Change
<b>Large City Teacher Salaries<sup>1</sup></b>												
BA-Minimum	\$22,465	\$23,130	\$23,668	\$24,131	\$24,819	\$25,410	\$26,120	\$26,980	\$27,945	\$29,125	\$30,700	36.7%
Annual Change		3.0%	2.3%	2.0%	2.9%	2.4%	2.8%	3.3%	3.6%	4.2%	5.4%	3.2% <sup>2</sup>
MA-Maximum	\$38,060	\$39,025	\$40,175	\$41,172	\$42,320	\$43,230	\$44,545	\$46,065	\$47,625	\$49,395	\$51,955	36.5%
Annual Change		2.5%	2.9%	2.5%	2.8%	2.2%	3.0%	3.4%	3.4%	3.7%	5.2%	3.2% <sup>2</sup>
<b>U.S. Average Teacher Salary</b>												
Average Salary	\$32,960	\$33,927	\$35,004	\$35,764	\$36,766	\$37,564	\$38,415	\$39,134	\$40,322	\$41,544	na	na
Annual Change		2.9%	3.2%	2.2%	2.8%	2.2%	2.3%	1.9%	3.0%	3.0%	na	na
<b>Adjusted for Inflation</b>												
Consumer Price Index (CPI)	137.9	141.9	145.8	149.7	153.6	158.6	161.5	164.0	168.3	174.0	179.2	29.9%
Annual Change		2.9%	2.7%	2.7%	2.6%	3.3%	1.8%	1.5%	2.6%	3.4%	3.0%	2.6% <sup>2</sup>
MA-Max for Large Cities	\$49,459	\$49,283	\$49,378	\$49,285	\$49,373	\$48,845	\$49,427	\$50,334	\$50,709	\$50,871	\$51,955	5.0%
U.S. Average Salary	\$42,831	\$42,845	\$43,023	\$42,812	\$42,894	\$42,443	\$42,625	\$42,761	\$42,934	\$42,786	na	na
<b>All Workers in U.S.<sup>3</sup></b>												
Annual Earnings	\$27,148	\$28,687	\$29,519	\$30,020	\$30,902	\$31,963	\$33,343	\$35,034	\$36,555	\$38,074	\$39,597	45.9%
Annual Change		5.7%	2.9%	1.7%	2.9%	3.4%	4.3%	5.1%	4.3%	4.2%	4.0%	3.7%

Sources: Civilian Personnel Management Service, Wage and Salary Division, "List of School District Minimums, Maximums and Steps," Arlington, Va., May 2001, [www.cpmns.osd.mil/wage/scheds/educators.htm](http://www.cpmns.osd.mil/wage/scheds/educators.htm). American Federation of Teachers, annual survey of state departments of education, [www.aft.org/research/salary](http://www.aft.org/research/salary). U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, The National Income and Product Accounts of the United States 1929-82, various issues of Survey of Current Business including March 2001, Table B.7, and unpublished data from the National Income and Product Accounts, [www.bea.doc.gov/](http://www.bea.doc.gov/).

<sup>1</sup> The 196 cities with more than 100,000 in population in 1990.

<sup>2</sup> Average of annual changes; not the compounded average annual change.

<sup>3</sup> All non-military workers in the U.S. regardless of industry, education or professional status including teachers and government workers.

Table I-2

SALARIES FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS AND SALARY OFFERS FOR NEW COLLEGE GRADUATES OUTSIDE THE FIELD OF TEACHING												
	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	Change	
<b>Beginning Teachers in Large Cities<sup>1</sup></b>												
BA-Minimum Salary	\$23,130	\$23,668	\$24,131	\$24,819	\$25,410	\$26,120	\$26,980	\$27,945	\$29,125	\$30,700		32.7%
Annual Change		2.3%	2.0%	2.9%	2.4%	2.8%	3.3%	3.6%	4.2%	5.4%		3.2% <sup>2</sup>
Substitute Teachers (Daily)	\$63.50	\$64.50	\$65.50	\$67.00	\$68.50	\$70.50	\$72.50	\$75.50	\$79.00	\$83.00		30.7%
Annual Change		1.6%	1.6%	2.3%	2.2%	2.9%	2.8%	4.1%	4.6%	5.1%		3.0% <sup>2</sup>
<b>Beginning Teachers in U.S.</b>												
Average Beginning Salary	\$21,856	\$22,768	\$23,231	\$23,997	\$24,285	\$25,015	\$25,735	\$26,806	\$27,895	na		na
Annual Change		4.2%	2.0%	3.3%	1.2%	3.0%	2.9%	4.2%	4.1%	na		na
<b>College Graduates Outside of Teaching</b>												
Average Salary Offer <sup>3</sup>	\$28,209	\$28,688	\$28,859	\$29,029	\$30,236	\$31,721	\$32,909	\$35,524	\$37,313	\$39,889		41.4%
Annual Change		1.6%	0.6%	0.6%	4.2%	4.9%	3.7%	7.9%	5.0%	6.9%		3.9% <sup>2</sup>
Greater Than Teachers By:	22%	21%	20%	17%	19%	21%	22%	27%	28%	30%		na

Sources: AFT calculations from National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE) Civilian Personnel Management Service, Wage and Salary Division, "List of School District Minimums, Maximums and Steps," Arlington, Va. May 2001, [www.cpmc.osd.mil/wage/scheds/educators.htm](http://www.cpmc.osd.mil/wage/scheds/educators.htm). American Federation of Teachers, annual survey of state departments of education, [www.aft.org/research/salary](http://www.aft.org/research/salary).

<sup>1</sup> The 196 cities with more than 100,000 in population in 1990.

<sup>2</sup> Average of annual changes; not the compounded average annual change.

<sup>3</sup> Offers for year preceding fall of school year.

Table I-3

**TEACHER SALARIES, EDUCATION EXPENDITURES AND FEDERAL REVENUE**

	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	Change
<b>MA-Maximum--Large Cities</b>	\$ 38,060	\$ 39,025	\$ 40,175	\$ 41,172	\$ 42,320	\$ 43,230	\$ 44,545	\$ 46,065	\$ 47,625	\$ 49,395	\$ 51,955	36.5%
Annual Change		2.5%	2.9%	2.5%	2.8%	2.2%	3.0%	3.4%	3.4%	3.7%	5.2%	3.2% <sup>2</sup>
<b>U.S. Expenditures for Public</b>												
<b>K-12 Education (\$Millions)</b>	\$ 206,114	\$ 215,100	\$ 224,279	\$ 234,979	\$ 247,920	\$ 259,481	\$ 273,210	\$ 288,005	\$ 308,491	\$ 331,768	\$ 353,301	71.4%
Annual Change		4.4%	4.3%	4.8%	5.5%	4.7%	5.3%	5.4%	7.1%	7.5%	6.5%	5.7% <sup>2</sup>
<b>Public K-12 Students</b>	42,047	42,823	43,465	44,111	44,840	45,611	46,127	46,535	46,812	47,026	47,176	12.2%
Annual Change		1.8%	1.5%	1.5%	1.7%	1.7%	1.1%	0.9%	0.6%	0.5%	0.3%	1.1% <sup>2</sup>
<b>Federal Revenue (\$Millions)</b>												
<b>Education for Disadvantaged</b>	\$ 5,193	\$ 6,129	\$ 6,582	\$ 6,819	\$ 6,785	\$ 7,006	\$ 7,187	\$ 7,800	\$ 7,534	\$ 8,511	\$ 8,432	62.4%
Annual Change		18.0%	7.4%	3.6%	-0.5%	3.3%	2.6%	8.5%	-3.4%	13.0%	-0.9%	3.7% <sup>2</sup>
<b>Indian Education</b>	\$ 59	\$ 63	\$ 91	\$ 70	\$ 69	\$ 75	\$ 51	\$ 50	\$ 56	\$ 64	\$ 82	39.0%
Impact Aid	747	785	468	797	803	945	651	724	1,076	875	1,121	50.1%
<b>School Improvement<sup>1</sup></b>	1,243	1,361	1,903	1,360	1,348	1,405	1,614	1,991	2,047	3,386	4,350	250.0%
Bilingual and Immigrant	148	160	101	176	189	160	171	204	284	319	370	150.0%
<b>Special Education</b>	2,006	2,067	2,356	2,748	2,938	2,991	3,067	3,425	4,251	4,696	5,535	175.9%
Vocational and Adult Ed.	1,038	1,020	1,133	1,292	1,449	1,323	1,382	1,425	1,338	1,448	1,669	60.8%
<b>Total Federal Revenue</b>	\$ 10,434	\$ 11,585	\$ 12,634	\$ 13,262	\$ 13,581	\$ 13,905	\$ 14,123	\$ 15,619	\$ 16,586	\$ 19,299	\$ 21,559	106.6%
Annual Change		11.0%	9.1%	5.0%	2.4%	2.4%	1.6%	10.6%	6.2%	16.4%	11.7%	7.6% <sup>2</sup>
<b>Percent of Current Spending</b>	5.1%	5.4%	5.6%	5.6%	5.5%	5.4%	5.2%	5.4%	5.4%	5.8%	6.1%	na

Sources: Civilian Personnel Management Service, Wage and Salary Division, "List of School District Minimums, Maximums and Steps," Arlington, Va., May 2001, [www.cpmss.osd.mil/wage/scheds/educators.htm](http://www.cpmss.osd.mil/wage/scheds/educators.htm). U.S. Department of Education, *Projection of Education Statistics to 2011*, and earlier editions, <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2000/projections/>. Office of Management and Budget, historical tables, Table 12.3, [www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/fy2002/hist.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/fy2002/hist.pdf).

<sup>1</sup> See text for description of programs in the Education for the Disadvantaged and School Improvement programs categories.

<sup>2</sup> Average of annual changes; not the compounded average annual change.

## Part II: City-by-City Trends

This analysis focuses on the school districts serving the nation's 100 largest school districts, a subset of the 196 cities with a population of more than 100,000. About 60 of these big-city districts overlap with the 100 largest school districts in the United States. The very large school districts that do not contain a large city include several large county school districts in Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Tennessee, Utah, and Virginia. This study focuses on large cities rather than large school districts for three primary reasons. First, the Department of Defense collects salary data from large school districts only if the district contains a city with more than 100,000 residents. Second, the large school districts without a central city are less likely to have the demographic characteristics of urban centers. Third, the South is overrepresented among the 100 largest school districts.

### Teacher Salaries

Teacher salaries are studied in three different ways. First, the 10-year change between 1990-91 and 2000-01 in the BA-minimum and MA-maximum salary is calculated (Table II-1). Second, a cost-of-living index (COL) is applied to the MA-maximum in 2000-01 (see Table II-2). The MA-maximum salary is ranked in 1990-91 and 2000-01 in order to assess the change in ranking over the decade. The COL-adjusted ranking is also calculated. Finally, the BA-minimum salary is ranked for both 1990-91 and 2000-01 (Table II-3). The daily rate of substitute teacher pay is also displayed in Table II-3.

The cost-of-living index in Table II-2 is based on the "Intercity Cost-of-Living Index" calculated by the American Chamber of Commerce Researchers Association (ACCRA). The items and weighting used by ACCRA reflect the typical expenditures of a family headed by a middle management-level executive, who owns a 2,000 square-foot home. ACCRA personnel price all items at the local level at a specified time and by standard specifications.<sup>3</sup> Among the 100 largest cities, the cost of living ranges from a low of 86.8 in Little Rock, Ark., to a high of 159.2 in San Jose, Calif. (Table II-2). An index value of 100 indicates a cost of living equal to the national average of all cities.<sup>4</sup> The 100 largest cities, however, have a cost-of-living index averaging 107.6.

---

<sup>3</sup> The index for Honolulu is an approximation based on several indexes included in *Poverty Measurement, Adjusting for Geographic Cost-of-Living Difference*, U.S. General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C., 1995 (GAO/GGD-95-64).

<sup>4</sup> More precisely, the average is based on Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSAs) and does not weight the calculation by population. Only one city represents each SMSA.



Almost all of the salary data for specific cities in Tables II-1, II-2 and II-3 match DOD salary data, including Los Angeles.<sup>5</sup> Exceptions include New York City and Baltimore (to adjust for large non-annual salary increases), Chicago (to reflect the value of the pension pick-up), and AFT estimates for three cities in California where DOD made no determination of the MA-maximum salary.

## Highlights

- The average MA-maximum and the average BA-minimum salaries both grew 36 percent over the decade. After accounting for inflation, which rose 30 percent over the 10 year period, urban teacher salaries grew about 0.5 percent per year. See Table II-1.
- Since 1990-91, urban teacher salaries failed to keep pace with inflation in about one in four cities; salary growth beat inflation by about 1 percent per year in one-third of the cities.
- At the maximum salary level for teachers with a master's degree, 12 school districts reported salaries greater than \$60,000: Yonkers, N.Y., reported the highest (\$81,067); followed by Jersey City, N.J. (\$75,150); Newark, N.J. (\$66,877); Santa Ana, Calif. (\$66,398); and Pittsburgh (\$66,380). See Table II-1.
- Four districts reported MA-maximum salaries below \$40,000. Wichita, Kan., reported the lowest salary (\$37,645); followed by Oklahoma City, Okla. (\$39,100); Tulsa, Okla. (\$39,450); and Baton Rouge, La. (\$39,853). See Table II-1.
- Of the 13 school districts reporting salaries of \$35,000 or above for beginning teachers holding a bachelor's degree, eight are in California. Fremont, Calif., reported a BA-minimum salary of \$43,884, followed by Yonkers (\$40,068), San Francisco (\$37,607) and Santa Ana, Calif. (\$37,586). See Table II-1.
- Ten districts reported BA-minimum salaries below \$26,000. Little Rock, Ark., reported the lowest BA-minimum salary (\$23,135). No other district paid less than \$24,000, but Jackson, Miss.; Tucson, Ariz.; and Lincoln, Neb., paid less than \$25,000 at the BA-minimum level. See Table II-1.
- It costs more to live in the SMSAs that include big cities. The 100 largest cities had an unweighted average cost-of-living index of 107.6 (100 is the average of all SMSAs in the ACCRA survey). See Table II-2.

<sup>5</sup> The BA-beginning salary of \$32,569 for Los Angeles in the DOD data set applies to new teachers without regular credentials (95 percent of teachers on the first step with only a BA). The BA-beginning salary for fully credentialed teachers was \$37,006. It is not clear exactly how the MA-maximum salary of \$45,166 was determined in the DOD data set. A certified teacher with 28 semester hours above a BA and the \$500 bonus for completing a master's degree earned \$45,513. Pay rose to \$47,389 with 42 semester hours, the hours accumulated by most teachers with a master's degree. For all school districts, the DOD data set applies to fall 2000 salaries. In early 2001, BA-beginning salaries in Los Angeles increased by 8 percent and MA-maximum salaries increased by 12 percent. This salary increase will be incorporated into the fall 2001 data.

- Salaries correlate closely with the cost of living. Little Rock, Ark., had the lowest cost of living and it had the lowest BA-beginning teacher salary (Table II-3). At the MA-maximum level, five of the highest paying 12 cities are in California (Table II-2); the six cities with the highest cost of living are located in California.
- Adjusting MA-maximum salaries to the cost-of-living index can make a big difference in the salary rankings. Little Rock, Ark., and Lubbock, Texas, had the biggest shift upward when cost-of-living was calculated. Little Rock moved from a rank of 89 to 48. Lubbock moved from a rank of 69 to 34. Other cities shifted downward. Boston moved from a rank of 13 to 68, and New York City went from 7 to 59. San Francisco plummeted from a rank of 16 to 94. See Table II-2.

### **Substitute Teacher Pay**

Many recent college graduates substitute teach while seeking permanent work. A hot college job market of the type seen over the past few years hurts the ability of school districts to attract substitute teachers. One response has been to lower standards for substitute teachers—even using college students (*The Arizona Republic*, May 7, 2000), police officers and firefighters (*The Plain Dealer*, Cleveland, Feb. 15, 2000) and parents (*Albuquerque Journal*, Dec. 23, 1999). Another response is to raise pay. Many Cleveland, Ohio, area school districts, for example, increased substitute pay by 50 percent—from about \$60 per day to about \$90 per day (*The Plain Dealer*, Jan. 24, 2000).

The data in Table II-3 include the average daily substitute pay for cities in the DOD data. This is the first time that comprehensive city-by-city data on substitute teacher salaries have been released to the public (data are not available for 1990-91).

Across all 100 districts, substitute teacher pay averaged about \$85 per day. If a substitute teacher worked 180 days a year, total pay comes to only \$15,300 for the year. One in four big-city school districts pays substitute teachers at least \$100 a day. Long Beach, Calif., pays \$146 per day. Los Angeles; Portland, Ore.; Milwaukee; Detroit; and Fremont, Calif., also pay more than \$120 per day. New Orleans; Shreveport, La.; Jackson, Miss., and Montgomery, Ala. still pay only \$50 per day. The BA-minimum salary is not a good predictor of substitute teacher pay. At the extremes, Seattle's BA-beginning salary is \$26,487 with a rank of 83, while it pays substitute teachers \$119 per day, ranked number 7. Houston, on the other hand, pays new teachers \$33,750 per year and substitute teachers only \$68 per day.

### **Revenue and Federal Support**

Total revenue for the 100 largest cities grew from \$5,710 per pupil to \$7,284 per pupil between 1991-92 and 1997-98, the most recent year for which city-by-city data are available (Table I-3). Revenue increases beat inflation in 86 cities. Revenue increased by at least 50 percent in Riverside, Calif.; Fort Wayne, Ind.; Nashville, Tenn.; San Jose, Calif.; Montgomery, Ala.; Oakland, Calif.; Mobile, Ala.; and Akron, Ohio. Over the six years, per-pupil spending rose an average of 28 per cent. After accounting for inflation, revenues improved 12 percent—a real spending increase of 2 percent per year. Spending clearly outpaced teacher salary growth of 18.1



percent over the six years—a real spending increase of 0.5 percent after accounting for inflation (calculations from data in Table I-1.)

From 1991-92 to 1997-88, the share of revenue coming from federal sources changed little, rising negligibly from an average of 8.5 percent of revenue to 8.6 percent of revenue (Table II-4). The share of revenue from federal sources declined in seven of the 10 largest cities but was significant only in Los Angeles (from 12.4 percent to 9.2 percent) and Detroit (from 12.5 percent to 10.4 percent). Washington, D.C.; Anchorage; and Wichita, Kan., became more reliant on federal revenue during this period than any of the other large cities.

### **Changing Student Demographics in Big Cities**

The leveling off of federal support for disadvantaged students (see Table I-3) came at precisely the same time that big cities were put under increasing pressure to close the student achievement gap between poor, minority youth concentrated in city schools and their more-advantaged peers. Making the task of narrowing the achievement gap even more difficult, the educational needs of city youth continued to grow in the nation's 100 largest cities between 1991-92 and 1998-99. The data in Table II-5 for free or reduced-price lunch eligibility and special education are easily available for only those U.S. cities that have school districts among the 100 largest.<sup>6</sup>

### **Highlights of Changes between 1991-92 and 1998-99**

- All but two cities (Atlanta, Ga., and Mobile, Ala.) showed an increase in the percentage of students receiving special education services, rising from 9.5 percent of students to 12.6 percent of students (Table II-5).
- Every city but one (San Antonio) showed an increase in the percentage of students eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunch (Table II-5).
- The percentage of students eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunch increased from an average of 44.8 percent of students to 56.7 percent of students, a 25 percent increase in just seven years.
- All of the 100 largest cities showed an increase in the enrollment of minority students, which increased from an average of 56.8 percent to 64.6 percent (Table II-6).
- Three out of four cities coped with enrollment growth. Although less than the national average growth in enrollment (9.3 percent), big cities averaged growth of 5.4 percent (Table II-6).

<sup>6</sup> About 60 of these big-city districts overlap with the 100 largest school districts in the United States. The very large school districts that do not contain a large city include several county school districts in Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Tennessee, Utah and Virginia.

Table II-1

**TEN-YEAR CHANGE IN BA-MINIMUM AND MA-MAXIMUM SALARIES IN 100 LARGEST CITIES**

		BA-Minimum			MA-Maximum				
		1990-91	2000-01	Change	1990-91	2000-01	Change	Steps	
1	New York	NY	\$26,238	\$31,910	22%	\$49,353	\$65,865 <sup>1</sup>	33%	22
2	Los Angeles	CA	29,529	32,569	10%	39,330	45,166	15%	10
3	Chicago	IL	26,447	33,197	26%	43,392	58,279 <sup>2</sup>	34%	12
4	Houston	TX	22,000	33,750	53%	36,500	53,586	47%	28
5	Philadelphia	PA	22,700	31,344	38%	43,250	55,274	28%	11
6	San Diego	CA	24,556	33,904	38%	38,795	53,143	37%	12
7	Detroit	MI	24,842	33,540	35%	45,082	63,059	40%	10
8	Dallas	TX	21,846	33,000	51%	37,002	55,821	51%	28
9	Phoenix	AZ	21,513	26,459	23%	38,992	46,560	19%	13
10	San Antonio	TX	20,000	32,000	60%	37,017	55,723	51%	29
11	San Jose	CA	24,337	35,665	47%	42,454	52,593	24%	8
12	Indianapolis	IN	20,311	27,772	37%	39,356	53,806	37%	20
13	Baltimore	MD	22,162	31,772	43%	40,339	56,117 <sup>3</sup>	39%	15
14	San Francisco	CA	26,008	37,607	45%	38,039	58,187 <sup>4</sup>	53%	12
15	Jacksonville	FL	21,050	27,510	31%	38,352	50,300	31%	23
16	Columbus	OH	21,053	32,442	54%	33,306	57,767	73%	16
17	Milwaukee	WI	22,012	27,948	27%	40,266	53,488	33%	17
18	Memphis	TN	21,223	32,045	51%	33,819	48,797	44%	19
19	Washington	DC	23,305	31,889	37%	45,502	54,096	19%	13
20	Boston	MA	27,357	35,997	32%	41,781	59,669	43%	8
21	Seattle	WA	20,001	26,487	32%	32,106	40,176	25%	12
22	El Paso	TX	20,200	28,647	42%	35,370	50,696	43%	31
23	Nashville	TN	19,326	26,861	39%	33,241	46,268	39%	17
24	Cleveland	OH	21,449	30,099	40%	41,053	57,921	41%	16
25	New Orleans	LA	20,039	25,439	27%	32,125	41,478	29%	26
26	Denver	CO	18,262	30,000	64%	36,714	48,589	32%	13
27	Austin	TX	21,035	30,270	44%	33,472	49,090	47%	25
28	Fort Worth	TX	22,260	35,000	57%	35,834	54,251	51%	31
29	Oklahoma City	OK	18,500	26,400	43%	29,815	39,100	31%	23
30	Portland	OR	20,394	29,818	46%	34,892	51,365	47%	14
31	Kansas City	MO	22,215	25,275	14%	37,654	43,699	16%	15
32	Long Beach	CA	25,587	36,298	42%	43,190	61,259	42%	14
33	Tucson	AZ	20,524	24,452	19%	39,033	46,823	20%	31
34	St. Paul	MN	23,465	29,363	25%	42,060	55,376	32%	12
35	Charlotte	NC	21,798	28,063	29%	41,714	55,574	33%	30
36	Atlanta	GA	26,196	33,419	28%	39,156	53,530	37%	13
37	Virginia Beach	VA	24,030	29,750	24%	40,638	53,110	31%	19
38	Albuquerque	NM	19,000	26,211	38%	31,745	41,262	30%	25
39	Oakland	CA	24,682	36,416	48%	32,878	50,825	55%	15
40	Pittsburgh	PA	26,000	34,300	32%	48,000	66,380	38%	10
41	Sacramento	CA	25,137	33,733	34%	35,591	47,761	34%	12
42	Minneapolis	MN	22,192	28,942	30%	41,869	54,603	30%	11
43	Tulsa	OK	17,600	26,000	48%	31,499	39,450	25%	19
44	Honolulu	HI	23,792	29,204	23%	39,664	48,783	23%	14
45	Cincinnati	OH	21,679	30,424	40%	39,020	54,762	40%	13
46	Miami	FL	26,500	32,275	22%	45,400	59,275	31%	20
47	Fresno	CA	23,670	30,714	30%	35,532	43,845	23%	6
48	Omaha	NE	20,228	26,701	32%	39,386	46,620	18%	24
49	Toledo	OH	20,100	29,098	45%	35,800	44,156	23%	11
50	Buffalo	NY	20,793	29,791	43%	37,256	53,376	43%	14

Table II-1 continued

		BA-Minimum			MA-Maximum			Steps
		1990-91	2000-01	Change	1990-91	2000-01	Change	
51	Wichita KS	21,405	26,631	24%	30,122	37,645	25%	12
52	Santa Ana CA	25,561	37,586	47%	45,150	66,398	47%	12
53	Mesa AZ	22,099	28,932	31%	35,197	44,511	26%	16
54	Colorado Springs CO	20,300	25,301	25%	36,518	44,606	22%	17
55	Tampa FL	21,403	30,001	40%	35,525	53,049	49%	33
56	Newark NJ	23,867	37,350	56%	46,232	66,877	45%	13
57	St. Petersburg FL	22,600	28,800	27%	36,900	48,650	32%	22
58	Louisville KY	19,023	26,443	39%	36,552	48,921	34%	18
59	Anaheim CA	24,829	37,366	50%	44,384	66,336	49%	12
60	Birmingham AL	21,831	29,502	35%	30,426	42,542	40%	12
61	Arlington TX	21,262	33,500	58%	37,627	50,985	36%	31
62	Norfolk VA	24,650	30,000	22%	38,920	49,640	28%	20
63	Las Vegas NV	21,200	26,847	27%	34,575	43,841	27%	11
64	Corpus Christi TX	20,000	29,000	45%	33,167	47,300	43%	22
65	St. Louis MO	21,110	28,000	33%	36,048	49,500	37%	11
66	Rochester NY	28,935	33,000	14%	53,160	65,364 <sup>4</sup>	23%	26
67	Jersey City NJ	25,610	35,000	37%	52,530	75,150	43%	16
68	Riverside CA	27,116	34,362	27%	45,306	61,137	35%	14
69	Anchorage AK	27,528	32,600	18%	42,615	52,334	23%	11
70	Lexington KY	21,811	25,680	18%	36,183	44,340	23%	27
71	Akron OH	21,200	27,605	30%	39,228	51,461	31%	13
72	Aurora CO	20,573	25,822	26%	38,895	48,497	25%	13
73	Baton Rouge LA	19,215	25,716	34%	27,206	39,853	46%	14
74	Stockton CA	25,575	33,792	32%	35,361	46,773	32%	12
75	Raleigh NC	21,054	27,750	32%	37,818	57,204	51%	30
76	Richmond VA	23,921	30,600	28%	40,711	53,116	30%	15
77	Shreveport LA	19,776	27,720	40%	32,482	43,097	33%	31
78	Jackson MS	19,494	24,909	28%	30,882	43,077	39%	27
79	Mobile AL	21,145	28,678	36%	28,567	41,195	44%	22
80	Des Moines IA	18,950	27,864	47%	33,989	47,381	39%	17
81	Lincoln NE	19,080	24,285	27%	35,564	49,331	39%	19
82	Madison WI	21,340	27,829	30%	38,079	48,225	27%	15
83	Grand Rapids MI	23,128	31,975	38%	41,142	56,880	38%	11
84	Yonkers NY	23,827	40,068	68%	48,209	81,067	68%	15
85	Montgomery AL	21,145	28,649	35%	29,505	40,781	38%	22
86	Lubbock TX	20,000	30,000	50%	35,500	47,884	35%	45
87	Greensboro NC	21,890	27,160	24%	41,370	53,830	30%	30
88	Dayton OH	20,915	28,362	36%	35,877	48,648	36%	15
89	Garland TX	20,500	32,200	57%	37,000	53,146	44%	41
90	Glendale CA	26,180	36,816	41%	39,636	55,739 <sup>4</sup>	41%	12
91	Columbus GA	22,732	30,005	32%	40,337	49,081	22%	20
92	Spokane WA	20,001	26,487	32%	33,374	48,704	46%	16
93	Tacoma WA	17,874	26,487	48%	32,641	41,698	28%	13
94	Little Rock AR	17,389	23,135	33%	31,248	42,499	36%	18
95	Bakersfield CA	24,512	34,529	41%	34,660	48,802	41%	11
96	Fremont CA	24,139	43,884	82%	32,615	60,669	86%	11
97	Fort Wayne IN	21,233	27,890	31%	39,918	52,433	31%	18
98	Newport News VA	23,000	29,178	27%	41,019	54,809	34%	33
99	Worcester MA	21,336	28,220	32%	35,621	50,633	42%	11
100	Knoxville TN	20,150	27,001	34%	30,610	40,987	34%	18
Unweighted Average		\$22,286	\$30,323	36%	\$37,898	\$51,533	36%	18
Consumer Price Index		137.9	179.2	30%	137.9	179.2	30%	na

Sources: Civilian Personnel Management Service, Wage and Salary Division, "List of School District Minimums, Maximums and Steps," Arlington, Va., May 2001, [www.cpmc.osd.mil/wage/scheds/educators.htm](http://www.cpmc.osd.mil/wage/scheds/educators.htm).

<sup>1</sup> Includes non-continuous increments to step 22; <sup>2</sup> Includes 7% pension pick-up; <sup>3</sup> Includes non-continuous increments to step 15; <sup>4</sup> AFT estimate.

Table II-2

**MA-MAXIMUM SALARIES ADJUSTED FOR THE COST OF LIVING (RANKED)**

			MA-Maximum				COL-Adjusted			Steps
			1990-91	Rank	2000-01	Rank	COL Index	MA-Max. 2000-01	Rank	
1	New York	NY	\$49,353	3	\$65,865	7	139.6	\$47,181	59	22
2	Los Angeles	CA	39,330	36	45,166	78	147.7	30,580	100	10
3	Chicago	IL	43,392	13	58,279	15	118.0	49,389	46	12
4	Houston	TX	36,500	59	53,586	35	94.3	56,825	8	28
5	Philadelphia	PA	43,250	14	55,274	27	120.4	45,909	64	11
6	San Diego	CA	38,795	44	53,143	40	120.8	43,993	75	12
7	Detroit	MI	45,082	11	63,059	9	108.9	57,905	7	10
8	Dallas	TX	37,002	53	55,821	22	99.9	55,877	13	28
9	Phoenix	AZ	38,992	41	46,560	76	99.0	47,030	61	13
10	San Antonio	TX	37,017	52	55,723	24	90.6	61,504	3	29
11	San Jose	CA	42,454	17	52,593	44	159.2	33,036	99	8
12	Indianapolis	IN	39,356	35	53,806	34	97.6	55,129	16	20
13	Baltimore	MD	40,339	28	56,117	21	96.8	57,972	6	15
14	San Francisco	CA	38,039	47	58,187	16	152.5	38,155	94	12
15	Jacksonville	FL	38,352	45	50,300	53	97.5	51,590	33	23
16	Columbus	OH	33,306	81	57,767	18	92.9	62,182	1	16
17	Milwaukee	WI	40,266	30	53,488	37	103.0	51,930	31	17
18	Memphis	TN	33,819	78	48,797	61	93.5	52,189	28	19
19	Washington	DC	45,502	7	54,096	32	114.7	47,163	60	13
20	Boston	MA	41,781	20	59,669	13	132.5	45,033	68	8
21	Seattle	WA	32,106	89	40,176	96	113.9	35,273	97	12
22	El Paso	TX	35,370	71	50,696	51	92.3	54,925	18	31
23	Nashville	TN	33,241	82	46,268	77	93.9	49,274	47	17
24	Cleveland	OH	41,053	24	57,921	17	109.8	52,751	26	16
25	New Orleans	LA	32,125	88	41,478	91	97.4	42,585	82	26
26	Denver	CO	36,714	56	48,589	66	110.0	44,172	72	13
27	Austin	TX	33,472	79	49,090	57	105.7	46,443	63	25
28	Fort Worth	TX	35,834	63	54,251	31	99.9	54,305	20	31
29	Oklahoma City	OK	29,815	97	39,100	99	94.1	41,552	85	23
30	Portland	OR	34,892	74	51,365	48	107.0	48,005	52	14
31	Kansas City	MO	37,654	49	43,699	85	99.3	44,007	74	15
32	Long Beach	CA	43,190	15	61,259	10	147.7	41,475	87	14
33	Tucson	AZ	39,033	39	46,823	73	98.8	47,392	58	31
34	St. Louis	MO	36,048	61	49,500	55	97.2	50,926	36	11
35	Charlotte	NC	41,714	21	55,574	25	98.5	56,420	11	30
36	Atlanta	GA	39,156	38	53,530	36	102.0	52,480	27	13
37	Virginia Beach	VA	40,638	27	53,110	42	98.8	53,755	23	19
38	Albuquerque	NM	31,745	90	41,262	92	99.9	41,303	88	25
39	Oakland	CA	32,878	84	50,825	50	152.5	33,328	98	15
40	Pittsburgh	PA	48,000	5	66,380	5	107.7	61,634	2	10
41	Sacramento	CA	35,591	66	47,761	70	113.1	42,229	83	12
42	Minneapolis	MN	41,869	19	54,603	30	109.5	49,866	43	11
43	Tulsa	OK	31,499	91	39,450	98	91.5	43,115	80	19
44	Honolulu	HI	39,664	32	48,783	62	133.0	36,679	96	14
45	Cincinnati	OH	39,020	40	54,762	29	98.3	55,709	14	13
46	Miami	FL	45,400	8	59,275	14	104.5	56,722	9	20
47	Fresno	CA	35,532	68	43,845	83	107.1	40,938	89	6
48	Omaha	NE	39,386	34	46,620	75	93.8	49,701	44	24
49	Toledo	OH	35,800	64	44,156	82	101.5	43,503	78	11
50	Buffalo	NY	37,256	51	53,376	38	100.2	53,269	24	14

Table II-2 continued

			MA-Maximum				COL-Adjusted			
			1990-91		2000-01		COL	MA-Max.		Steps
				Rank		Rank	Index	2000-01	Rank	
51	Wichita	KS	30,122	96	37,645	100	95.9	39,254	93	12
52	Santa Ana	CA	45,150	10	66,398	4	127.6	52,036	29	12
53	Mesa	AZ	35,197	73	44,511	80	99.0	44,961	69	16
54	Colorado Springs	CO	36,518	58	44,606	79	97.3	45,844	65	17
55	Tampa	FL	35,525	69	53,049	43	102.6	51,705	32	33
56	Newark	NJ	46,232	6	66,877	3	139.0	48,113	49	13
57	St. Paul	MN	42,060	18	55,376	26	109.5	50,572	38	12
58	Louisville	KY	36,552	57	48,921	59	97.3	50,279	41	18
59	Anaheim	CA	44,384	12	66,336	6	127.6	51,987	30	12
60	Birmingham	AL	30,426	95	42,542	88	95.0	44,781	70	12
61	Arlington	TX	37,627	50	50,985	49	99.9	51,036	35	31
62	Norfolk	VA	38,920	42	49,640	54	98.8	50,243	42	20
63	Las Vegas	NV	34,575	76	43,841	84	105.6	41,516	86	11
64	Corpus Christi	TX	33,167	83	47,300	72	93.6	50,534	39	22
65	St. Petersburg	FL	36,900	55	48,650	64	102.6	47,417	57	22
66	Rochester	NY	53,160	1	65,364	8	110.4	59,206	4	26
67	Jersey City	NJ	52,530	2	75,150	2	139.0	54,065	22	16
68	Riverside	CA	45,306	9	61,137	11	108.1	56,556	10	14
69	Anchorage	AK	42,615	16	52,334	46	122.3	42,791	81	11
70	Lexington	KY	36,183	60	44,340	81	97.5	45,477	66	27
71	Akron	OH	39,228	37	51,461	47	101.2	50,851	37	13
72	Aurora	CO	38,895	43	48,497	67	110.0	44,088	73	13
73	Baton Rouge	LA	27,206	100	39,853	97	104.8	38,028	95	14
74	Stockton	CA	35,361	72	46,773	74	103.8	45,061	67	12
75	Raleigh	NC	37,818	48	57,204	19	105.5	54,222	21	30
76	Richmond	VA	40,711	26	53,116	41	105.2	50,490	40	15
77	Shreveport	LA	32,482	87	43,097	86	92.0	46,845	62	31
78	Jackson	MS	30,882	93	43,077	87	96.7	44,547	71	27
79	Mobile	AL	28,567	99	41,195	93	94.8	43,455	79	22
80	Des Moines	IA	33,989	77	47,381	71	98.7	48,005	51	17
81	Lincoln	NE	35,564	67	49,331	56	99.7	49,479	45	19
82	Madison	WI	38,079	46	48,225	68	101.1	47,700	53	15
83	Grand Rapids	MI	41,142	23	56,880	20	104.7	54,327	19	11
84	Yonkers	NY	48,209	4	81,067	1	139.6	58,071	5	15
85	Montgomery	AL	29,505	98	40,781	95	97.7	41,741	84	22
86	Lubbock	TX	35,500	70	47,884	69	93.1	51,433	34	45
87	Greensboro	NC	41,370	22	53,830	33	97.9	54,985	17	30
88	Dayton	OH	35,877	62	48,648	65	101.2	48,071	50	15
89	Garland	TX	37,000	54	53,146	39	99.9	53,199	25	41
90	Glendale	CA	39,636	33	55,739	23	127.6	43,682	76	12
91	Columbus	GA	40,337	29	49,081	58	103.0	47,651	54	20
92	Spokane	WA	33,374	80	48,704	63	102.7	47,424	56	16
93	Tacoma	WA	32,641	85	41,698	90	103.3	40,366	91	13
94	Little Rock	AR	31,248	92	42,499	89	86.8	48,962	48	18
95	Bakersfield	CA	34,660	75	48,802	60	102.8	47,473	55	11
96	Fremont	CA	32,615	86	60,669	12	152.5	39,783	92	11
97	Fort Wayne	IN	39,918	31	52,433	45	93.6	56,018	12	18
98	Newport News	VA	41,019	25	54,809	28	98.8	55,475	15	33
99	Worcester	MA	35,621	65	50,633	52	124.2	40,767	90	11
100	Knoxville	TN	30,610	94	40,987	94	93.9	43,650	77	18
Unweighted Average			\$37,898		\$51,533		107.6	\$48,285		18

Sources: American Chamber of Commerce Researchers Association, "Intercity Cost of Living Index," ACCRA: Louisville, Ky. Estimates for missing data are based on data from past years, or geographic proximity to cities listed in the ACCRA index. The index for New York City is based on Long Island. Salary data from Civilian Personnel Management Service, Wage and Salary Division, "List of School District Minimums, Maximums and Steps," Arlington, Va., May 2001, [www.cpmo.osd.mil/wage/scheds/educators.htm](http://www.cpmo.osd.mil/wage/scheds/educators.htm).

Table II-3

**BA-BEGINNING SALARIES AND SUBSTITUTE TEACHER PAY (RANKED)**

			BA-Minimum		BA-Minimum		Substitute Teacher (Daily Rate)	
			1990-91	Rank	2000-01	Rank	2000-01	Rank
1	New York	NY	\$26,238	8	\$31,910	35	\$110.29	13
2	Los Angeles	CA	29,529	1	32,569	28	139.00	2
3	Chicago	IL	26,447	7	33,197	24	99.58	26
4	Houston	TX	22,000	45	33,750	19	68.00	79
5	Philadelphia	PA	22,700	37	31,344	38	75.00	63
6	San Diego	CA	24,556	22	33,904	17	113.97	9
7	Detroit	MI	24,842	18	33,540	21	122.18	5
8	Dallas	TX	21,846	47	33,000	26	90.00	39
9	Phoenix	AZ	21,513	52	26,459	86	65.00	85
10	San Antonio	TX	20,000	85	32,000	33	85.00	43
11	San Jose	CA	24,337	24	35,665	11	100.00	21
12	Indianapolis	IN	20,311	76	27,772	72	85.00	47
13	Baltimore	MD	22,162	42	31,772	37	70.00	73
14	San Francisco	CA	26,008	11	37,607	3	115.00	8
15	Jacksonville	FL	21,050	68	27,510	76	68.17	78
16	Columbus	OH	21,053	67	32,442	29	85.00	42
17	Milwaukee	WI	22,012	44	27,948	68	124.14	4
18	Memphis	TN	21,223	60	32,045	32	75.00	62
19	Washington	DC	23,305	33	31,889	36	70.00	72
20	Boston	MA	27,357	4	35,997	10	93.97	34
21	Seattle	WA	20,001	83	26,487	83	119.00	7
22	El Paso	TX	20,200	79	28,647	63	60.50	88
23	Nashville	TN	19,326	90	26,861	79	62.03	87
24	Cleveland	OH	21,449	53	30,099	43	99.65	25
25	New Orleans	LA	20,039	82	25,439	94	50.00	99
26	Denver	CO	18,262	97	30,000	48	111.12	11
27	Austin	TX	21,035	69	30,270	42	70.00	74
28	Fort Worth	TX	22,260	39	35,000	13	75.00	61
29	Oklahoma City	OK	18,500	96	26,400	88	80.00	54
30	Portland	OR	20,394	75	29,818	49	131.28	3
31	Kansas City	MO	22,215	40	25,275	96	80.00	56
32	Long Beach	CA	25,587	14	36,298	9	146.16	1
33	Tucson	AZ	20,524	73	24,452	98	75.00	65
34	St. Louis	MO	21,110	65	28,000	67	85.00	46
35	Charlotte	NC	21,798	50	28,063	66	74.00	67
36	Atlanta	GA	26,196	9	33,419	23	79.00	57
37	Virginia Beach	VA	24,030	26	29,750	51	65.00	83
38	Albuquerque	NM	19,000	94	26,211	89	65.00	86
39	Oakland	CA	24,682	20	36,416	8	107.82	17
40	Pittsburgh	PA	26,000	12	34,300	16	85.00	41
41	Sacramento	CA	25,137	17	33,733	20	84.89	48
42	Minneapolis	MN	22,192	41	28,942	58	110.00	14
43	Tulsa	OK	17,600	99	26,000	90	70.00	75
44	Honolulu	HI	23,792	30	29,204	54	113.20	10
45	Cincinnati	OH	21,679	51	30,424	41	92.54	36
46	Miami	FL	26,500	6	32,275	30	80.00	51
47	Fresno	CA	23,670	31	30,714	39	93.18	35
48	Omaha	NE	20,228	78	26,701	81	110.00	15
49	Toledo	OH	20,100	81	29,098	56	84.47	49
50	Buffalo	NY	20,793	71	29,791	50	85.00	45



Table II-3 continued

			BA-Minimum		BA-Minimum		Substitute Teacher (Daily Rate)	
			1990-91	Rank	2000-01	Rank	2000-01	Rank
51	Wichita	KS	21,405	54	26,631	82	78.00	58
52	Santa Ana	CA	25,561	16	37,586	4	105.00	18
53	Mesa	AZ	22,099	43	28,932	59	80.00	52
54	Colorado Springs	CO	20,300	77	25,301	95	70.00	77
55	Tampa	FL	21,403	55	30,001	45	67.69	80
56	Newark	NJ	23,867	28	37,350	6	95.00	31
57	St. Paul	MN	23,465	32	29,363	53	105.00	19
58	Louisville	KY	19,023	93	26,443	87	74.86	66
59	Anaheim	CA	24,829	19	37,366	5	95.00	30
60	Birmingham	AL	21,831	48	29,502	52	58.00	94
61	Arlington	TX	21,262	58	33,500	22	70.00	70
62	Norfolk	VA	24,650	21	30,000	46	65.00	81
63	Las Vegas	NV	21,200	61	26,847	80	80.00	53
64	Corpus Christi	TX	20,000	86	29,000	57	60.00	90
65	St. Petersburg	FL	22,600	38	28,800	60	65.00	84
66	Rochester	NY	28,935	2	33,000	25	77.00	59
67	Jersey City	NJ	25,610	13	35,000	12	90.00	37
68	Riverside	CA	27,116	5	34,362	15	90.00	38
69	Anchorage	AK	27,528	3	32,600	27	100.00	22
70	Lexington	KY	21,811	49	25,680	93	70.00	76
71	Akron	OH	21,200	62	27,605	75	83.54	50
72	Aurora	CO	20,573	72	25,822	91	80.00	55
73	Baton Rouge	LA	19,215	91	25,716	92	60.00	93
74	Stockton	CA	25,575	15	33,792	18	111.00	12
75	Raleigh	NC	21,054	66	27,750	73	76.00	60
76	Richmond	VA	23,921	27	30,600	40	72.00	69
77	Shreveport	LA	19,776	88	27,720	74	50.00	98
78	Jackson	MS	19,494	89	24,909	97	50.00	100
79	Mobile	AL	21,145	63	28,678	61	60.00	91
80	Des Moines	IA	18,950	95	27,864	70	100.00	23
81	Lincoln	NE	19,080	92	24,285	99	100.00	24
82	Madison	WI	21,340	56	27,829	71	102.60	20
83	Grand Rapids	MI	23,128	34	31,975	34	85.00	44
84	Yonkers	NY	23,827	29	40,068	2	98.00	27
85	Montgomery	AL	21,145	64	28,649	62	50.00	97
86	Lubbock	TX	20,000	87	30,000	47	65.00	82
87	Greensboro	NC	21,890	46	27,160	77	74.00	68
88	Dayton	OH	20,915	70	28,362	64	90.00	40
89	Garland	TX	20,500	74	32,200	31	70.00	71
90	Glendale	CA	26,180	10	36,816	7	95.00	32
91	Columbus	GA	22,732	36	30,005	44	75.00	64
92	Spokane	WA	20,001	84	26,487	84	108.53	16
93	Tacoma	WA	17,874	98	26,487	85	95.00	33
94	Little Rock	AR	17,389	100	23,135	100	53.00	96
95	Bakersfield	CA	24,512	23	34,529	14	96.00	28
96	Fremont	CA	24,139	25	43,884	1	120.57	6
97	Fort Wayne	IN	21,233	59	27,890	69	95.45	29
98	Newport News	VA	23,000	35	29,178	55	60.00	89
99	Worcester	MA	21,336	57	28,220	65	60.00	92
100	Knoxville	TN	20,150	80	27,001	78	53.00	95
Unweighted Average			\$22,286		\$30,323		\$84.82	

Sources: Civilian Personnel Management Service, Wage and Salary Division, "List of School District Minimums, Maximums and Steps," Arlington, Va., May 2001, [www.cpms.osd.mil/wage/scheds/educators.htm](http://www.cpms.osd.mil/wage/scheds/educators.htm).

Table II-4

**GENERAL REVENUE PER PUPIL AND FEDERAL SUPPORT, 1991-92 AND 1997-98**

			General Revenue Per Pupil		Change Adjusted for Inflation		Federal Share of Revenue		
			1991-92	1997-98	Change		1991-92	1997-98	Change
1	New York	NY	\$7,186	\$8,542	19%	3%	10.4%	9.5%	-0.9%
2	Los Angeles	CA	5,743	7,236	26%	10%	12.4%	9.2%	-3.2%
3	Chicago	IL	5,723	7,202	26%	10%	13.6%	13.4%	-0.3%
4	Houston	TX	4,249	5,674	34%	18%	9.7%	10.3%	0.6%
5	Philadelphia	PA	6,883	7,301	6%	-9%	12.1%	11.7%	-0.3%
6	San Diego	CA	5,266	7,210	37%	21%	8.6%	7.9%	-0.6%
7	Detroit	MI	5,897	8,128	38%	22%	12.5%	10.4%	-2.1%
8	Dallas	TX	4,691	5,964	27%	12%	9.7%	10.2%	0.5%
9	Phoenix	AZ	8,154	8,449	4%	-12%	7.2%	6.6%	-0.7%
10	San Antonio	TX	5,143	7,042	37%	21%	12.8%	12.9%	0.1%
11	San Jose	CA	5,298	8,016	51%	36%	7.6%	5.3%	-2.3%
12	Indianapolis	IN	6,414	9,129	42%	27%	8.3%	8.5%	0.2%
13	Baltimore	MD	6,394	7,663	20%	4%	13.5%	12.0%	-1.5%
14	San Francisco	CA	5,271	7,429	41%	25%	8.5%	6.6%	-1.8%
15	Jacksonville	FL	5,311	6,010	13%	-2%	7.6%	7.5%	-0.1%
16	Columbus	OH	6,395	8,233	29%	13%	8.0%	9.2%	1.3%
17	Milwaukee	WI	6,722	8,619	28%	13%	8.9%	11.3%	2.4%
18	Memphis	TN	4,460	5,951	33%	18%	12.9%	10.6%	-2.4%
19	Washington	DC	8,801	9,168	4%	-11%	9.1%	16.5%	7.3%
20	Boston	MA	7,699	10,774	40%	24%	9.5%	6.2%	-3.3%
21	Seattle	WA	6,769	8,422	24%	9%	7.3%	7.7%	0.4%
22	El Paso	TX	4,609	5,804	26%	10%	11.6%	10.3%	-1.3%
23	Nashville	TN	4,245	6,459	52%	37%	8.2%	8.6%	0.3%
24	Cleveland	OH	6,566	8,599	31%	15%	11.6%	9.8%	-1.7%
25	New Orleans	LA	5,058	5,624	11%	-4%	14.4%	14.5%	0.1%
26	Denver	CO	6,377	6,626	4%	-12%	7.7%	8.7%	1.0%
27	Austin	TX	5,029	6,252	24%	9%	6.0%	6.9%	0.9%
28	Fort Worth	TX	4,668	5,907	27%	11%	8.4%	10.0%	1.6%
29	Oklahoma City	OK	3,896	5,544	42%	27%	7.2%	11.1%	3.9%
30	Portland	OR	6,767	7,970	18%	2%	6.3%	7.3%	1.0%
31	Kansas City	MO	11,937	11,153	-7%	-22%	4.8%	7.5%	2.7%
32	Long Beach	CA	4,896	6,409	31%	15%	11.5%	11.8%	0.3%
33	Tucson	AZ	4,387	5,736	31%	15%	8.3%	10.4%	2.1%
34	St. Louis	MO	8,123	8,891	9%	-6%	10.9%	11.5%	0.6%
35	Charlotte	NC	4,825	6,529	35%	20%	5.8%	5.5%	-0.3%
36	Atlanta	GA	6,803	9,751	43%	28%	9.5%	7.7%	-1.8%
37	Virginia Beach	VA	4,470	6,200	39%	23%	6.5%	6.0%	-0.6%
38	Albuquerque	NM	4,120	5,583	35%	20%	7.3%	7.4%	0.1%
39	Oakland	CA	5,166	7,790	51%	35%	11.2%	8.5%	-2.7%
40	Pittsburgh	PA	9,002	10,647	18%	3%	7.1%	8.6%	1.5%
41	Sacramento	CA	4,755	6,472	36%	21%	11.2%	10.4%	-0.8%
42	Minneapolis	MN	7,755	10,642	37%	22%	6.4%	6.5%	0.1%
43	Tulsa	OK	3,917	5,582	42%	27%	8.8%	9.5%	0.7%
44	Honolulu	HI	5,704	6,736	18%	3%	7.2%	8.4%	1.2%
45	Cincinnati	OH	5,901	8,297	41%	25%	8.8%	10.0%	1.2%
46	Miami	FL	5,415	7,391	36%	21%	7.9%	7.9%	0.0%
47	Fresno	CA	4,713	6,262	33%	17%	12.8%	12.2%	-0.6%
48	Omaha	NE	5,750	6,510	13%	-2%	7.7%	9.4%	1.7%
49	Toledo	OH	5,868	7,383	26%	10%	7.8%	10.8%	3.1%
50	Buffalo	NY	7,695	9,957	29%	14%	9.3%	12.4%	3.1%



Table II-4 continued

			General Revenue Per Pupil		Change Adjusted for Inflation		Federal Share of Revenue		
			1991-92	1997-98	Change		1991-92	1997-98	Change
51	Wichita	KS	5,280	6,510	23%	8%	5.5%	10.8%	5.3%
52	Santa Ana	CA	4,484	6,589	47%	31%	8.2%	8.2%	-0.1%
53	Mesa	AZ	4,635	5,547	20%	4%	4.2%	6.0%	1.7%
54	Colorado Springs	CO	4,454	5,737	29%	13%	5.1%	4.8%	-0.3%
55	Tampa	FL	5,891	6,914	17%	2%	8.9%	9.1%	0.3%
56	Newark	NJ	10,880	12,686	17%	1%	9.9%	7.5%	-2.4%
57	St. Paul	MN	7,736	8,951	16%	0%	6.9%	6.8%	-0.1%
58	Louisville	KY	4,867	6,646	37%	21%	10.9%	9.5%	-1.4%
59	Anaheim	CA	3,818	5,449	43%	27%	7.1%	5.0%	-2.1%
60	Birmingham	AL	3,898	5,489	41%	25%	13.6%	11.5%	-2.1%
61	Arlington	TX	4,346	5,290	22%	6%	4.4%	4.5%	0.1%
62	Norfolk	VA	5,802	6,452	11%	-4%	11.2%	11.3%	0.1%
63	Las Vegas	NV	5,069	6,411	26%	11%	4.2%	4.4%	0.3%
64	Corpus Christi	TX	4,573	6,023	32%	16%	8.5%	9.1%	0.7%
65	St. Petersburg	FL	6,050	6,716	11%	-5%	5.7%	6.0%	0.4%
66	Rochester	NY	9,345	10,585	13%	-2%	8.8%	10.1%	1.4%
67	Jersey City	NJ	9,704	11,612	20%	4%	9.7%	6.5%	-3.2%
68	Riverside	CA	4,271	7,733	81%	65%	6.4%	5.1%	-1.3%
69	Anchorage	AK	6,847	7,379	8%	-8%	4.1%	8.7%	4.6%
70	Lexington	KY	4,541	6,592	45%	30%	6.4%	5.3%	-1.1%
71	Akron	OH	4,915	7,354	50%	34%	8.4%	10.6%	2.2%
72	Aurora	CO	5,177	6,555	27%	11%	9.8%	5.2%	-4.6%
73	Baton Rouge	LA	4,690	5,579	19%	3%	9.2%	10.1%	0.9%
74	Stockton	CA	4,854	6,431	32%	17%	11.7%	10.0%	-1.7%
75	Raleigh	NC	5,676	6,007	6%	-10%	3.3%	4.2%	0.9%
76	Richmond	VA	7,182	8,989	25%	10%	7.5%	9.6%	2.1%
77	Shreveport	LA	4,310	5,901	37%	21%	9.5%	10.2%	0.7%
78	Jackson	MS	3,675	5,452	48%	33%	10.9%	11.3%	0.4%
79	Mobile	AL	3,379	5,071	50%	35%	14.2%	11.7%	-2.5%
80	Des Moines	IA	5,424	7,556	39%	24%	6.4%	5.6%	-0.8%
81	Lincoln	NE	5,429	7,139	31%	16%	5.1%	5.9%	0.8%
82	Madison	WI	7,069	9,358	32%	17%	3.8%	3.6%	-0.2%
83	Grand Rapids	MI	6,855	8,608	26%	10%	7.8%	7.8%	0.0%
84	Yonkers	NY	10,028	11,870	18%	3%	6.9%	6.1%	-0.7%
85	Montgomery	AL	3,357	5,077	51%	36%	14.1%	11.7%	-2.4%
86	Lubbock	TX	4,592	6,164	34%	19%	7.6%	8.8%	1.3%
87	Greensboro	NC	5,156	6,447	25%	9%	3.6%	5.8%	2.2%
88	Dayton	OH	6,064	8,499	40%	25%	11.2%	14.1%	2.9%
89	Garland	TX	3,971	5,578	40%	25%	3.9%	4.1%	0.3%
90	Glendale	CA	4,510	6,221	38%	22%	8.0%	9.5%	1.5%
91	Columbus	GA	4,577	6,446	41%	25%	9.2%	6.3%	-2.9%
92	Spokane	WA	5,104	6,451	26%	11%	6.1%	7.3%	1.2%
93	Tacoma	WA	6,162	7,744	26%	10%	7.8%	9.3%	1.5%
94	Little Rock	AR	5,483	7,049	29%	13%	6.1%	6.2%	0.0%
95	Bakersfield	CA	4,914	6,286	28%	12%	10.1%	12.0%	1.9%
96	Fremont	CA	4,763	6,381	34%	18%	2.5%	3.0%	0.5%
97	Fort Wayne	IN	4,998	7,807	56%	41%	7.4%	5.2%	-2.3%
98	Newport News	VA	4,978	5,935	19%	4%	8.6%	8.3%	-0.3%
99	Worcester	MA	6,343	8,754	38%	22%	9.9%	7.5%	-2.4%
100	Knoxville	TN	4,015	5,505	37%	22%	7.2%	7.6%	0.5%
Unweighted Average			\$5,710	\$7,284	28%	12%	8.5%	8.6%	0.1%

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Public Elementary-Secondary Finances, 1997-98.

[www.census.gov/govs/school/98tables.pdf](http://www.census.gov/govs/school/98tables.pdf); and 1992 Census of Governments, Public Education Finances, GC92(4)-1,[www.census.gov/prod/2/gov/gc92-4/gc92\\_4\\_1.pdf](http://www.census.gov/prod/2/gov/gc92-4/gc92_4_1.pdf).

Table II-5

**LOW-INCOME STUDENTS AND SPECIAL EDUCATION**

			Special Education			Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch		
			1991-92	1998-99	Change	1991-92	1998-99	Change
			(percent of enrollment)			(percent of enrollment)		
1	New York	NY	10.5	13.8	3.3	<sup>1</sup>	64.1	<sup>1</sup>
2	Los Angeles	CA	8.8	11.7	2.9	68.0	73.2	5.2
3	Chicago	IL	3.7	11.8	8.1	<sup>1</sup>	83.2	<sup>1</sup>
4	Houston	TX	8.6	10.6	2.0	49.1	66.6	17.5
5	Philadelphia	PA	<sup>1</sup>	10.4	9.4	<sup>1</sup>	78.4	<sup>1</sup>
6	San Diego	CA	9.7	10.5	0.8	48.4	61.0	12.6
7	Detroit	MI	8.9	11.8	2.9	65.4	65.8	0.4
8	Dallas	TX	6.4	8.9	2.5	57.5	70.4	12.9
9	Phoenix	AZ	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>
10	San Antonio	TX	9.7	12.7	3.0	72.1	65.4	-6.7
11	San Jose	CA	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>
12	Indianapolis	IN	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>
13	Baltimore	MD	15.7	17.5	1.8	60.6	68.3	7.7
14	San Francisco	CA	10.9	11.2	0.3	47.6	57.0	9.4
15	Jacksonville	FL	13.8	16.1	2.3	31.6	47.1	15.5
16	Columbus	OH	<sup>1</sup>	12.8	<sup>1</sup>	47.7	56.6	8.9
17	Milwaukee	WI	11.1	13.9	2.8	52.9	73.3	20.4
18	Memphis	TN	8.2	11.6	3.4	<sup>1</sup>	<sup>1</sup>	<sup>1</sup>
19	Washington	DC	8.8	11.4	2.6	54.8	70.0	15.2
20	Boston	MA	18.1	22.4	4.3	<sup>1</sup>	72.4	<sup>1</sup>
21	Seattle	WA	8.0	9.9	1.9	<sup>1</sup>	<sup>1</sup>	<sup>1</sup>
22	El Paso	TX	7.2	9.3	2.1	52.5	66.6	14.1
23	Nashville	TN	9.9	14.4	4.5	<sup>1</sup>	<sup>1</sup>	<sup>1</sup>
24	Cleveland	OH	<sup>1</sup>	17.2	<sup>1</sup>	75.0	82.1	7.1
25	New Orleans	LA	4.7	8.6	3.9	73.0	75.4	2.4
26	Denver	CO	9.7	10.9	1.2	42.0	53.4	11.4
27	Austin	TX	9.3	11.5	2.2	37.0	49.0	12.0
28	Fort Worth	TX	9.0	11.2	2.2	48.4	54.8	6.4
29	Oklahoma City	OK	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>
30	Portland	OR	8.2	9.8	1.6	31.1	37.7	6.6
31	Kansas City	MO	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>
32	Long Beach	CA	6.6	8.2	1.6	57.9	68.5	10.6
33	Tucson	AZ	8.0	10.8	2.8	<sup>1</sup>	<sup>1</sup>	<sup>1</sup>
34	St. Louis	MO	14.7	15.2	0.5	<sup>1</sup>	76.7	<sup>1</sup>
35	Charlotte	NC	8.1	10.9	2.8	18.6	37.9	19.3
36	Atlanta	GA	6.9	6.4	-0.5	63.5	75.0	11.5
37	Virginia Beach	VA	<sup>1</sup>	12.7	11.7	<sup>1</sup>	24.5	<sup>1</sup>
38	Albuquerque	NM	15.0	20.0	5.0	27.6	38.4	10.8
39	Oakland	CA	9.0	10.2	1.2	48.2	60.7	12.5
40	Pittsburgh	PA	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>
41	Sacramento	CA	10.2	11.8	1.6	52.1	59.9	7.8
42	Minneapolis	MN	10.5	14.1	3.6	47.9	57.6	9.7
43	Tulsa	OK	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>
44	Honolulu	HI	7.0	10.3	3.3	19.9	38.0	18.1
45	Cincinnati	OH	<sup>1</sup>	14.5	13.5	50.4	59.8	9.4
46	Miami	FL	8.3	10.8	2.5	44.4	58.7	14.3
47	Fresno	CA	10.0	11.9	1.9	58.9	72.2	13.3
48	Omaha	NE	11.9	17.6	5.7	34.9	49.6	14.7
49	Toledo	OH	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup>
50	Buffalo	NY	10.3	19.2	8.9	<sup>1</sup>	65.9	<sup>1</sup>
51	Wichita	KS	9.9	12.8	2.9	38.4	52.5	14.1
52	Santa Ana	CA	6.7	9.6	2.9	57.9	75.5	17.6

Table II-5 continued

			Special Education			Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch		
			1991-92	1998-99	Change	1991-92	1998-99	Change
53	Mesa	AZ	6.8	8.0	1.2	1	1	1
54	Colorado Springs	CO	2	2	2	2	2	2
55	Tampa	FL	10.8	13.5	2.7	36.2	47.8	11.6
56	Newark	NJ	2	2	2	70.6	76.0	5.4
57	St. Paul	MN	3	13.8	3	3	52.9	3
58	Louisville	KY	3	12.9	3	3	48.0	3
59	Anaheim	CA	2	2	2	2	2	2
60	Birmingham	AL	2	2	2	2	2	2
61	Arlington	TX	6.8	10.0	3.2	16.1	34.1	18.0
62	Norfolk	VA	2	2	2	2	2	2
63	Las Vegas	NV	6.1	10.1	4.0	15.9	35.3	19.4
64	Corpus Christi	TX	2	2	2	2	2	2
65	St. Petersburg	FL	12.9	18.5	5.6	25.9	38.4	12.5
66	Rochester	NY	2	2	2	2	2	2
67	Jersey City	NJ	2	2	2	2	73.0	2
68	Riverside	CA	2	2	2	2	2	2
69	Anchorage	AK	12.0	14.8	2.8	13.1	28.8	15.7
70	Lexington	KY	2	2	2	2	2	2
71	Akron	OH	2	2	2	2	2	2
72	Aurora	CO	2	2	2	2	2	2
73	Baton Rouge	LA	3.6	11.4	7.8	44.7	51.1	6.4
74	Stockton	CA	2	2	2	2	2	2
75	Raleigh	NC	8.7	12.3	3.6	11.7	20.8	9.1
76	Richmond	VA	2	2	2	2	2	2
77	Shreveport	LA	6.5	12.9	6.4	45.4	53.1	7.7
78	Jackson	MS	2	2	2	2	2	2
79	Mobile	AL	14.8	14.2	-0.6	1	59.4	1
80	Des Moines	IA	2	2	2	2	2	2
81	Lincoln	NE	2	2	2	2	2	2
82	Madison	WI	2	2	2	2	2	2
83	Grand Rapids	MI	2	2	2	2	2	2
84	Yonkers	NY	2	2	2	2	2	2
85	Montgomery	AL	8.9	12.4	3.5	13.1	22.5	9.4
86	Lubbock	TX	2	2	2	2	2	2
87	Greensboro	NC	3	13.9	3	3	36.9	3
88	Dayton	OH	2	2	2	2	2	2
89	Garland	TX	3	13.1	3	3	32.7	3
90	Glendale	CA	2	2	2	2	2	2
91	Columbus	GA	2	2	2	2	2	2
92	Spokane	WA	2	2	2	2	2	2
93	Tacoma	WA	2	2	2	2	2	2
94	Little Rock	AR	2	2	2	2	2	2
95	Bakersfield	CA	2	2	2	2	2	2
96	Fremont	CA	2	2	2	2	2	2
97	Fort Wayne	IN	2	2	2	2	2	2
98	Newport News	VA	2	2	2	2	2	2
99	Worcester	MA	2	2	2	2	2	2
100	Knoxville	TN	14.4	14.6	0.2	1	1	1
Unweighted Average			9.5	12.6	3.1	44.8	56.7	11.8

Sources: National Center for Education Statistics, *Characteristics of the 100 Largest Public Elementary and Secondary School Districts in the United States: 1998-99*, [www.nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2000345](http://www.nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2000345), and *Characteristics of the 100 Largest Public Elementary and Secondary School Districts in the United States: 1991-92*, [www.nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=93131](http://www.nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=93131). Education Funding Research Council, [www.dc.thompson.com/titleonline/](http://www.dc.thompson.com/titleonline/) for 2000-2001 Title I allocations.

<sup>1</sup> Data not reported. <sup>2</sup> Not one of the 100 largest school districts. <sup>3</sup> Not one of the 100 largest school districts in 1991-92.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table II-6

## CHANGE IN ENROLLMENT OF MINORITY STUDENTS

			Enrollment			Percent Minority Students		
			1991-92	1998-99	Change	1991-92	1998-99	Change
1	New York	NY	962,269	1,063,561	10.5%	81.5	84.5	3.0
2	Los Angeles	CA	636,964	667,305	4.8%	86.9	89.5	2.6
3	Chicago	IL	409,731	421,334	2.8%	88.4	89.9	1.5
4	Houston	TX	196,689	209,375	6.4%	86.3	89.5	3.2
5	Philadelphia	PA	195,735	212,150	8.4%	77.3	81.6	4.3
6	San Diego	CA	123,591	133,687	8.2%	64.5	71.8	7.3
7	Detroit	MI	169,320	182,316	7.7%	92.3	95.7	3.4
8	Dallas	TX	137,746	154,847	12.4%	84.1	90.7	6.6
9	Phoenix <sup>1</sup>	AZ	na	21,534	na	na	78.0	na
10	San Antonio	TX	59,848	61,361	2.5%	93.8	95.2	1.4
11	San Jose	CA	30,261	32,843	8.5%	61.3	69.3	8.0
12	Indianapolis	IN	47,136	42,084	-10.7%	53.4	62.8	9.4
13	Baltimore	MD	110,325	108,759	-1.4%	82.7	87.8	5.1
14	San Francisco	CA	61,689	61,174	-0.8%	86.1	87.8	1.7
15	Jacksonville	FL	115,940	126,118	8.8%	41.0	48.2	7.2
16	Columbus	OH	63,723	63,894	0.3%	51.6	60.4	8.8
17	Milwaukee	WI	93,381	101,007	8.2%	69.8	79.8	10.0
18	Memphis	TN	105,005	111,156	5.9%	80.0	86.9	6.9
19	Washington	DC	80,618	78,648	-2.4%	96.0	95.7	-0.3
20	Boston	MA	60,922	63,239	3.8%	79.1	84.4	5.3
21	Seattle	WA	44,423	47,629	7.2%	56.8	59.6	2.8
22	El Paso	TX	64,728	64,444	-0.4%	78.7	83.1	4.4
23	Nashville	TN	69,103	69,888	1.1%	41.1	54.1	13.0
24	Cleveland	OH	71,640	74,026	3.3%	77.2	80.5	3.3
25	New Orleans	LA	83,847	85,064	1.5%	93.1	95.3	2.2
26	Denver	CO	60,552	66,331	9.5%	67.0	75.6	8.6
27	Austin	TX	67,937	76,054	11.9%	57.0	64.3	7.3
28	Fort Worth	TX	71,224	75,813	6.4%	66.8	76.0	9.2
29	Oklahoma City	OK	36,097	39,398	9.1%	56.0	66.0	10.0
30	Portland	OR	54,496	56,856	4.3%	29.0	34.6	5.6
31	Kansas City	MO	35,227	37,861	7.5%	74.3	82.3	8.0
32	Long Beach	CA	74,048	83,038	12.1%	74.1	81.1	7.0
33	Tucson	AZ	56,764	62,867	10.8%	48.0	55.8	7.8
34	St. Louis	MO	40,956	44,620	8.9%	79.6	82.6	3.0
35	Charlotte	NC	77,746	93,533	20.3%	43.8	50.3	6.5
36	Atlanta	GA	59,905	60,064	0.3%	93.3	93.4	0.1
37	Virginia Beach	VA	71,683	76,677	7.0%	25.1	34.9	9.8
38	Albuquerque	NM	90,155	89,092	-1.2%	53.0	58.0	5.0
39	Oakland	CA	51,698	53,462	3.4%	91.9	94.2	2.3
40	Pittsburgh	PA	40,384	39,602	-1.9%	53.8	58.1	4.3
41	Sacramento	CA	50,804	51,240	0.9%	65.7	74.1	8.4
42	Minneapolis	MN	41,597	47,978	15.3%	53.7	69.8	16.1
43	Tulsa	OK	41,180	42,852	4.1%	40.2	51.8	11.6
44	Honolulu	HI	174,747	187,653	7.4%	76.1	79.2	3.1
45	Cincinnati	OH	50,914	50,396	-1.0%	64.6	73.6	9.0
46	Miami	FL	304,554	341,117	12.0%	81.6	87.4	5.8
47	Fresno	CA	74,693	78,470	5.1%	68.7	78.5	9.8
48	Omaha	NE	42,536	44,761	5.2%	34.8	44.1	9.3
49	Toledo	OH	39,720	39,581	-0.3%	45.1	52.5	7.4
50	Buffalo	NY	48,241	47,845	-0.8%	60.0	69.3	9.3

Table II-6 continued

			Enrollment			Percent Minority Students		
			1991-92	1998-99	Change	1991-92	1998-99	Change
51	Wichita	KS	47,222	46,391	-1.8%	32.8	44.1	11.3
52	Santa Ana	CA	47,700	52,107	9.2%	93.8	96.8	3.0
53	Mesa	AZ	64,164	70,181	9.4%	17.6	28.7	11.1
54	Colorado Springs	CO	30,602	32,589	6.5%	23.3	27.7	4.4
55	Tampa	FL	127,439	147,826	16.0%	36.6	45.9	9.3
56	Newark	NJ	48,374	43,609	-9.9%	82.0	91.7	9.7
57	St. Paul	MN	34,265	43,766	27.7%	44.7	62.5	17.8
58	Louisville	KY	91,450	104,358	14.1%	31.8	37.4	5.6
59	Anaheim	CA	44,749	48,109	7.5%	26.9	34.4	7.5
60	Birmingham	AL	42,082	39,493	-6.2%	89.7	96.0	6.3
61	Arlington	TX	46,445	53,343	14.9%	29.0	46.3	17.3
62	Norfolk	VA	37,323	37,852	1.4%	na	70.6	na
63	Las Vegas	NV	129,233	179,106	38.6%	31.7	45.7	14.0
64	Corpus Christi	TX	41,797	40,290	-3.6%	74.1	76.2	2.1
65	St. Petersburg	FL	96,333	107,060	11.1%	21.9	26.1	4.2
66	Rochester	NY	33,792	38,121	12.8%	73.8	82.5	8.7
67	Jersey City	NJ	29,246	32,505	11.1%	88.2	90.7	2.5
68	Riverside	CA	32,490	36,713	13.0%	47.7	56.2	8.5
69	Anchorage	AK	24,538	28,819	17.4%	59.0	66.9	7.9
70	Lexington	KY	32,371	34,337	6.1%	24.6	25.6	1.0
71	Akron	OH	34,150	32,361	-5.2%	40.8	50.2	9.4
72	Aurora	CO	26,759	29,027	8.5%	33.2	52.0	18.8
73	Baton Rouge	LA	62,946	61,499	-2.3%	56.7	68.4	11.7
74	Stockton	CA	33,457	36,124	8.0%	80.0	84.3	4.3
75	Raleigh	NC	66,931	85,735	28.1%	30.7	34.1	3.4
76	Richmond	VA	31,200	27,621	-11.5%	na	92.7	na
77	Shreveport	LA	51,592	49,577	-3.9%	58.7	62.9	4.2
78	Jackson	MS	33,401	31,936	-4.4%	81.1	91.8	10.7
79	Mobile	AL	67,523	64,833	-4.0%	47.9	52.0	4.1
80	Des Moines	IA	31,446	31,406	-0.1%	19.4	26.9	7.5
81	Lincoln	NE	28,809	31,013	7.7%	9.8	11.9	2.1
82	Madison	WI	23,849	25,327	6.2%	22.3	33.3	11.0
83	Grand Rapids	MI	27,029	26,354	-2.5%	48.7	63.1	14.4
84	Yonkers	NY	na	25,277	na	na	77.7	na
85	Montgomery	AL	35,316	34,605	-2.0%	61.8	73.2	11.4
86	Lubbock	TX	30,860	29,565	-4.2%	51.9	57.4	5.5
87	Greensboro	NC	25,289	30,292	19.8%	39.0	46.9	7.9
88	Dayton	OH	27,798	26,695	-4.0%	64.0	71.8	7.8
89	Garland	TX	39,192	44,869	14.5%	32.4	47.0	14.6
90	Glendale	CA	26,996	30,312	12.3%	41.6	42.4	0.8
91	Columbus	GA	31,230	33,349	6.8%	na	63.5	na
92	Spokane	WA	30,549	32,403	6.1%	11.5	13.3	1.8
93	Tacoma	WA	30,773	32,940	7.0%	35.2	41.3	6.1
94	Little Rock	AR	25,971	24,441	-5.9%	65.6	70.9	5.3
95	Bakersfield	CA	25,892	27,176	5.0%	67.4	78.2	10.8
96	Fremont	CA	28,077	30,919	10.1%	39.0	54.9	15.9
97	Fort Wayne	IN	31,640	31,680	0.1%	27.0	32.9	5.9
98	Newport News	VA	29,513	33,335	13.0%	41.1	60.3	19.2
99	Worcester	MA	21,052	25,412	20.7%	37.2	45.6	8.4
100	Knoxville	TN	50,788	51,224	0.9%	13.0	16.6	3.6
Unweighted Average			80,042	84,385	5.4%	56.8	64.6	7.8

Sources: National Center for Education Statistics, Digest of Education Statistics 1993, [www.nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=93292](http://www.nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=93292). National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics* 2000, [www.nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2001034](http://www.nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2001034).

<sup>1</sup> Phoenix contains independent school districts. Information applies to Phoenix Union High School.



U.S. Department of Education  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)  
National Library of Education (NLE)  
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



# REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

VD035583

## I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Teacher Salaries, Expenditures and Federal Revenue in School Districts Serving the Nation's Largest Cities, 1990-91 to 2000-01

Author(s): F. Howard Nelson and Jewell C. Gould (AFT Research & Information Service Dept.)

Corporate Source: American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO  
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20001-2079

Publication Date:  
October 2001

## II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sample  
\_\_\_\_\_

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1



Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sample  
\_\_\_\_\_

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A



Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sample  
\_\_\_\_\_

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B



Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.  
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign  
here, →  
please

Signature: Jewell C. Gould  
Organization/Address: American Federation of Teachers  
555 New Jersey Ave., NW  
Washington, DC 20001-2079

Printed Name/Position/Title: Jewell C. Gould Director  
Telephone: (202) 879-4428  
E-Mail Address: jgould@aft.org  
FAX: (202) 879-4406  
Date: 4/16/03

### III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:

Address:

Price:

### IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:

Address:

### V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education  
Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University  
New York, NY 10027

Telephone: 212-678-3433  
Toll Free: 800-601-4868  
Fax: 212-678-4012

WWW: <http://eric-web.tc.columbia.edu>

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

#### ERIC Processing and Reference Facility

4483-A Forbes Boulevard  
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200

Toll Free: 800-799-3742

FAX: 301-552-4700

e-mail: [ericfac@inet.ed.gov](mailto:ericfac@inet.ed.gov)

WWW: <http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com>